

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are all the claims pending in the application.

In this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-6 and 9 are amended. No new matter is added.

Applicant respectfully submits entrance and allowance of the claims including the amended claims.

In the Final Office Action and Advisory Action, the Examiner alleges that the claimed channel state judging section is disclosed inherently in Lee (primary reference) or with a support from Jeong as the term “channel states” used in the claim is taught by Jeong.

According to Lee, the reference teaches selecting only one channel with the best channel condition between an NTSC interference rejection filter (NRF) state and a non-NRF state. By contrast, the claimed system is characterized in that, rather than selecting one channel, the channel judging section is provided for judging channel states (not a single state) that comprise (both) a static state and a dynamic state, and the equalizing section is provided for compensating channel distortion by initializing parameters based on the judged channel states (not a single state). In this respect, assuming, *arguendo*, that the NRF state and the non-NRF state correspond to static and dynamic states, respectively, Lee fails to teach judging two states and initializing parameters for each state, because, in Lee, only one of the NRF and non-NRF states is selected.

In addition, Lee also fails to teach using field syncs of an input signal. Describing that a field sync is used in col. 5, lines 10-15 does not necessarily mean that the field sync is used to determine one of static and dynamic states. In Lee, the field sync appears to be used only to determine a state having a better condition between an NRF and a non-NRF state with respect to

a ghost and a phase error, but the field sync is not taught as being used to determine the channel states comprising a static state and a dynamic state.

Jeong, the Examiner's secondary reference, may teach that there is a dynamic state and a static state with respect to a state of an input signal. However, only because this state demarcation is known in Jeong, alleging that the field sync is also known as used for determining static and dynamic states is impermissible and illogical while Lee teaches only that the field sync is used to determine an NRF and a non-NRF state.

Therefore, at least for the above reasons, claim 1 and corresponding method claim 5 as amended would not have been anticipated by Lee.

Claim 2, corresponding method claim 6, and claim 9 should be allowable as the claims are amended to overcome the objection and 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection as indicated in the Final Office Action and discussed with the Examiner in a telephonic interview on September 21, 2007.

Claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 should be allowable at least due to their dependencies.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Seunghee Park  
Registration No. 60,719

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 9, 2007